

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated September 9, 2004. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the Office Action are respectfully requested.

Claims 8, 22, 29 and 31 are pending and have been amended. Claims 1-7, 9-21, 23-28, 30 and 32 have been canceled herein without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Support for the claim changes can be found in the original disclosure, and therefore no new matter has been added. Claims 8 and 22 are in independent form.

Claims 1, 2, 5-9, 14-16, 19-23 and 28-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,487,534 (*Thelen et al.*), and Claims 3, 4, 10-13, 17, 18 and 24-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Thelen et al.*

Since Claims 1-7, 9-21, 23-28, 30 and 32 have been canceled, the rejections of those claims are moot. In response to the rejection of the other claims, Applicants respectfully submit the following remarks.

Independent Claim 8 recites, *inter alia*, selection means for selecting an input field on a graphical user interface display, designation means for designating one of a plurality of usable speech recognition means according to the selection made by the selection means, and output means for outputting a character string recognized by the designated speech recognition means to the input field selected by the selection means.

Examples of the above-noted features can be found in the specification at, e.g., page 13, lines 13-15 (“The application program 208 outputs the input character string to a pre-selected input field on the graphical user interface display on the display unit 207.”) and page 20, line 26 - page 21, line 2 (“The switching instruction reception unit 503 in Fig. 5 processes a switching instruction [i.e., a selection] input on the GUI to switch [i.e., designate] a speech recognition destination.”).

Thelen et al. relates to a distributed client-server speech recognition system, including a client station and a server station connected via a network. The client station includes means for receiving a speech input signal from a user, and a speech controller for directing at least a part of the speech input signal to a local speech recognizer. In dependence on the outcome of recognition by the local speech recognizer, the speech controller selectively directs a part of the speech input signal via the network to the server station. The server station includes means for receiving the speech equivalent signal from the network and a large/huge vocabulary speech recognizer for recognizing the received speech equivalent signal.

However, Applicants submit that nothing in *Thelen et al.* would suggest at least the selection means, designation means or output means, as claimed in independent Claim 8.

In regard to the designation means, it is noted that the Examiner states that “Thelen et al. disclose the use of a web page containing advertising banners of different companies, each company having its own recognition servers (Col. 2, lines 36-40). The users select the banner by saying the banner’s name, tag name, etc. (Col. 2, lines 45-48).

The examiner takes the official notice that it is extremely well-known in the art to navigate web pages using GUI by clicking on the banner using a standard IO device, such as a computer mouse.” Even if, for the sake of argument, *Thelen et al.* be deemed to suggest designating one of a plurality of speech recognition means according to a selection of a representation such as a banner on a GUI, Applicants submit that nothing in *Thelen et al.* would suggest designating one of a plurality of speech recognition means according to a selection of an input field on a GUI, such as is claimed in independent Claim 8.

Since *Thelen et al.* is not seen to contain all of the elements of independent Claim 8, that claim is believed allowable over the cited art. Since independent Claim 22 recites features similar or identical to those of Claim 8, Claim 22 is believed allowable for at least the same reasons as pertain to Claim 8.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicants’ opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from independent Claim 22 and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons as pertain to that claim. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to the below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Douglas W. Pinsky", is written over a horizontal line.

Attorney for Applicants
Douglas W. Pinsky
Registration No. 46,994

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
DWP/tmc

DC_MAIN 187219v1